

Northumbria Research Link

Citation: Sukumar, Arun, Jafari-Sadeghi, Vahid, Xu, Zimu and Tomlins, Richard (2019) Young students and desire to social entrepreneurship: The impact of government's role. International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Small Business. ISSN 1476-1297 (In Press)

Published by: Inderscience

URL:

This version was downloaded from Northumbria Research Link:
<http://nrl.northumbria.ac.uk/id/eprint/46351/>

Northumbria University has developed Northumbria Research Link (NRL) to enable users to access the University's research output. Copyright © and moral rights for items on NRL are retained by the individual author(s) and/or other copyright owners. Single copies of full items can be reproduced, displayed or performed, and given to third parties in any format or medium for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge, provided the authors, title and full bibliographic details are given, as well as a hyperlink and/or URL to the original metadata page. The content must not be changed in any way. Full items must not be sold commercially in any format or medium without formal permission of the copyright holder. The full policy is available online: <http://nrl.northumbria.ac.uk/policies.html>

This document may differ from the final, published version of the research and has been made available online in accordance with publisher policies. To read and/or cite from the published version of the research, please visit the publisher's website (a subscription may be required.)



**Northumbria
University**
NEWCASTLE



UniversityLibrary

YOUNG STUDENTS AND DESIRE TO SOCIAL ENTREPRENEURSHIP: THE IMPACT OF GOVERNMENT'S ROLE

Arun Sukumar*, Vahid Jafari Sadeghi, Zimu Xu and Richard Tomlins

Faculty of Business and Law, Coventry University,
Gosford Street, Coventry, CV1 5DL,

Email: arun.sukumar@coventry.ac.uk

Email: Vahid.JafariSadeghi@coventry.ac.uk

Email: Zimu.Xu@coventry.ac.uk

Email: Richard.Tomlins@Coventry.ac.uk

*Corresponding Author

Abstract

The main aim of the research was intended in assessing the role of the Indonesian government towards the promotion of social entrepreneurship in the country. The research was focused on addressing the level of awareness about the concept of social enterprise and what it means in Indonesia, especially among young students. For achieving this aim, a survey was conducted among students in Jakarta, Indonesia. The survey reflected the assessment of government role in the promotion of social entrepreneurship in Indonesia. The results noted that when it came to social entrepreneurship, it is the government that acts as a vital role in communication what a social enterprise is and its role to the members of the society. From the regression analysis, it was identified that there is a significant relationship between the promotion of social entrepreneurship and the role of the Indonesian government. However, the study also identifies that while the promotion of social enterprise is essential, the role of innovation and its link to the building resilient social enterprises needs more attention.

Keywords: Social Entrepreneurship, Government Support, Young People, Social Enterprise, ANOVA

Biographical Notes: Arun Sukumar, is an Associate Professor at the International Centre for Transformational Entrepreneurship, Coventry University. He is an active researcher and his principal research interests are in the field of social enterprise in an international context. Arun has worked extensively with international partners in Vietnam, Thailand, India, Malaysia and Africa to develop start-up ecosystems and in development of trans-national education programs aimed at doctoral students.

Vahid Jafari Sadeghi is a Lecturer in Strategy in the School of Strategy and Leadership at Coventry University. Vahid holds his PhD in international entrepreneurship from the University of Turin where he has served as a post-doctoral fellow for one year. Vahid has published papers in several international journals and publications such as International Business Review, Journal of International Entrepreneurship, Research in International Business and Finance, International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Small Business, etc.

Zimu Xu is a lecturer at the international centre for transformational entrepreneurship at Coventry University. Zimu's PhD project looks at business growth and role of entrepreneurial ecosystems with particular focus on the UK digital gaming industry. Zimu is also interested in the broad topic of creative and technology-intensive industry.

Dr Richard Tomlins is an Assistant Professor of the International Centre for Transformational Entrepreneurship (ICTE), Coventry University. He is an internationally recognized expert in the creative economy, social value and entrepreneurial innovation, community cohesion, regeneration, equalities and social inclusion as well as driving business and social gains through commissioning, procurement and social impact measurement.

Introduction

The fundamental purpose of a business organisation is to maximise the wealth of shareholders or investors by making consistent profits. Social problems of the society in which they operate are not considered the responsibility of business organisations (Meyer, Narjoud and Granata, 2017). Instead, government and other social entities assume the responsibility to address social issues. However, in the last couple of decades, the notion of social enterprises has emerged which can be defined as a business organisation that not only makes a profit but is also dedicated to addressing one or more of the social issues. There are several inspiring stories whereby entrepreneurs have successfully managed to make a profit and increase the wealth of investors while contributing positively to the betterment of society (Dana, 2017; Jafari Sadeghi and Biancone, 2017c). Therefore, the concept of social enterprise has gained a lot of interest in academics as well as other stakeholders to address existing social issues (Allen 2013). Governments and youth are considered to be the main actors in the success of social enterprises. This study aims to evaluate the role of government in promoting social entrepreneurship among young students in Indonesia.

The concept of social entrepreneurship has attracted various groups in society, particularly those entrepreneurs who want to make a positive in society and not just make a profit (Anderson, Dana and Dana, 2006; Jafari Sadeghi, Jashnsaz and Honari Chobar, 2014; Dana and Dumez, 2015). Various institutions that are particularly interested in social enterprises are emerging and developing across the globe. Researchers and other academics have also taken interest and made significant contributions. According to Willets et al., (2015), due to the support from all stakeholders across the world, the phenomenon of social enterprises is gaining momentum, and the number of social enterprises is increasing.

According to ANGIN¹ (2018), the social finance ecosystem in Indonesia is gradually progressing into the growth stage, having successfully passed the initial or nascent stage in only seven years. The transition is reflected by the increasing number of social enterprises. For example, ANGIN reported that it received ten funding proposals for social enterprises per month in 2016 as compared to only four proposals per month in 2015. In addition, the number of social enterprises funded by ANGIN has also increased in 2015 and 2016. Overall, approximately USD 20 million was invested in social enterprise in two years (2015 and 2016). Since there has been a rise in social enterprises in Indonesia, therefore, it is important to analyse factors that play a positive role in the promotion of social enterprises in this economy. The role of government and youth in the social enterprise sector has been identified as one of the positive factors in other countries, particularly European countries. Thus, this study aims to assess the role of the Indonesian government in promoting social entrepreneurship among youth in Indonesia. Therefore, the main objectives of this study are,

- To explore the current status of social enterprises in Indonesia.
- To explore the intention of developing social enterprise among young students in Indonesia
- To explore the role of government in promoting social enterprise among students in Indonesia.

Literature Review

According to Choi and Majumdar (2014), social entrepreneurship is the amalgamation of a social mission with the image of business-like and systematic discipline, determination and innovation commonly associated with the high-tech pioneers of business entities. In other words, social entrepreneurship utilizes the approaches of entrepreneurship in order to unravel social problems (Lemaire, Maalaoui and Dana, 2017). However, Zahra, Newey and Li (2014)

¹ Angel Investment Network Indonesia

stated that social entrepreneurship might include the ventures which are socially oriented and with minimal profit. This might imply that social entrepreneurship is highly associated with community development but would be in a minimal business profit. Nevertheless, the main aim of social entrepreneurs would be fulfilled once the social mission has been achieved.

Significance of Social Entrepreneurship

According to Shahidullah and Islam (2018) and Giddens (2013), in the new era, the development of social entrepreneurship and NGOs has been acknowledged increasingly. It has been due to the fact that in order to address current socio-economic development challenges, social entrepreneurship has the potential of creating and generating new intellectual capital and energy (Ghaedi and Madhoushi, 2018). Kostetska and Berezyak (2014) stated that social entrepreneurship relates to solving social problems. It might imply that it would be beneficial for society to develop collectively as well as personal well-being and welfare. This led to the implication as reiterated by Osburg and Schmidpeter (2013) that social entrepreneurship helps the societies to develop and emerge as an improved social cohesion. The notion that social entrepreneurship leads toward social cohesion also leads to reducing inequities in society. The implication of this aspect suggested that it might be done through the reintegration of people into labour, decent jobs for excluded and marginalised people and delivery and provision of collective social services to the people with low income.

One survey conducted by Leitch, McMullan and Harrison (2013) suggested that the principles of social entrepreneurship include financial sustainability, self-reliance and pragmatic problem-solving. It has been considered as a redefining problem-solving strategy through building new models, therefore, altering equilibrium with the public ownership. According to Phillips et al. (2015), the main reason behind this is that social entrepreneurship would be useful for poor communities who require to have permission to enter in government agencies and NGOs. Those social communities which have minimum access to the financial aids might get positively affected by the rise of social entrepreneurship (Dana and Dumez, 2015; Jafari Sadeghi and Biancone, 2017b). However, it has been identified in the study of Zahra and Wright (2016) the benefits associated with social entrepreneurship cannot be measured numerically because there are not many ways to measure development. It has been due to the notion that social entrepreneurs can access in the business world by having access to social relations and fostering public good.

Development of Social Entrepreneurship

According to literature, it would not be wrong to profess that the social entrepreneurship is rising in today's world when the traditional boundaries between private, voluntary and public sectors have been changing and blurring) (Bromley and Meyer 2014; Lemaire, Maalaoui, and Dana 2017; Jafari Moghadam 2017; Ratten and Dana 2017). This might imply that the forces of globalization have been using contemporary means of social development instead of traditional boundaries. Becker (2013) explained that the shift from traditional to contemporary had been taken over to the market approach where the market approaches have incorporated the distribution and allocation of scarce resources. It has been due to the fact that the governments are unable to afford social welfare development required by social welfare units.

According to Rouboutsos and Pantelias (2015), one of the dimensions of social development has been associated with the fundamentals of infrastructure and revenue streams. However, social entrepreneurship has been associated with social issues and the mitigating factors for solving these issues with the development of community and society which leads to the notion that social entrepreneurship includes the energetic individuals who higher willingness to pursue goals and tolerance for uncertainty due to which the field has

been developing fast and maximizing the contribution in both developed and developing countries (Akinbami *et al.*, 2019). Hence, the development of social entrepreneurship might be related to individuals who have the ability to associate fully with social action.

Factors affecting the development of Social Entrepreneurship

Bacq, Hartog and Hoogendoorn (2013) suggested that there four main factors which affect the development of social entrepreneurship. These factors are given below:

Identification of Social Issue

Development of social entrepreneurship gets affected by the environment where people are inclined towards identifying and solving social issues. One empirical survey conducted by Leonardi, Huysman and Steinfield (2013) the social entrepreneurs might be considered as people who are zealous about problem-solving mechanisms in the society. This might imply that the urge of people to take positive and fruitful steps towards societal issues by using resource development and social action lead towards the development of social entrepreneurship in society.

Development of Social Mission

According to Wilson and Post (2013), the development of social entrepreneurship leads to the development of social entrepreneurship. The focus of social entrepreneurship has been on social ventures where social entrepreneurs attempt to improve the livelihood of people and community infrastructure. The development of social mission might have a huge impact on the development of social entrepreneurship. Lombard (2014) stated that social entrepreneurship should focus on utilising the resources in a manner which bring welfare to the environment and community. The implication suggests that social entrepreneurs might be considered as important for society's own good; however, for some purposes, it could face the number of issues such as lack of funds and resources (Lemaire, Maalaoui and Dana, 2017; Jafari Sadeghi, Biancone, *et al.*, 2019; Jafari Sadeghi, Kimiagari and Biancone, 2019).

Support Development

As discussed by Nandan, London and Blum (2014), the development of social entrepreneurship can be ensured if there is prior support for development. However, it has been argued by Lee (2015) every social entrepreneur must develop strategies and plans which gather support from different business entities. Support development is defined as the factors which bring support for social development that might lead towards the efficient way of managing societal issues. This support, as stated by Covaleski, Dirsmith and Weiss (2013), is often associated with volunteers who would want to work for society's own good. The development of social entrepreneurship is based on this support as well as the support of the government. This might imply that on the social level, the entrepreneurs seek like-minded experts and people as well as funders who support the institution financially in order to achieve goals and objectives (Anderson *et al.*, 2005; Ramadani *et al.*, 2013; Jafari Sadeghi, Nkongolo-Bakenda, *et al.*, 2019).

Development of Sustainable Models

The development of social entrepreneurship is mainly based upon the development of sustainable business models. According to Abereiyo (2016), social entrepreneurs aim to design and develop a business in a way which would not only bring profit to the organization but also be beneficial for society. This might imply that the development of social entrepreneurship is not only based upon profitability but also sustainable business practices and models. In this way, Dana and Wright (2009) and Scaffa and Reitz (2013) suggested that entrepreneurs should develop future strategies for providing sustainable income, resources

and livelihood to the society and people of the community. This might imply that the community demands for social and economic development for which social entrepreneurship plays a crucial role.

Relationship between Social Entrepreneurship and Young Students

In today's world, young people, especially students, in general, are having ever-increasing interest in pursuing careers which might have a positive impact on society. As defined by Bae et al. (2014) social entrepreneurship has made social entrepreneurs inclined towards investing and collaborating with young students for assisting them to incorporate and engage in activities which are beneficial for the society. However, some of the critics give the idea that unemployment amongst young students and people have been rising day by day. For instance, it has been explained by Sánchez (2013) that the social sector should nurture and bring talent at the forefront as well as bring value to students in terms of working for social benefits. This would result in high-level involvement of the young student in the societal good as well as mitigation of unemployment from the economy. According to one empirical analysis conducted by Vanevenhoven and Liguori (2013), there has been several social challenges and austerity for young students in the society; the social entrepreneurship has been rising for facing the challenges and for creating more jobs and higher turnover for the enterprise.

The study conducted by Vanevenhoven and Liguori (2013) has led to the notion that social entrepreneurship has an effective relationship with young generation especially those enthusiasts who have been active and engaged in achieving social and economic development. According to one survey conducted by Almeida, Ahmetoglu and Chamorro-Premuzic (2014), young students are more energetic and enthusiastic and can be beneficial for both society and the economy. This leads to the comprehension of the utmost importance of social entrepreneurship for society. If social enterprises are being led by young enthusiasts, the result might be a higher societal benefit and socio-economic development.

Governments and Social Entrepreneurship

Governments play an important role in creating policies and strategies for supporting social entrepreneurship in a country. Social entrepreneurship has been recognized as a separate business sector by many governments in the world. According to Mazzucato (2015), social entrepreneurship is considered to be a third sector, the position of which lies between private sectors and government. The UK government had launched Social Enterprise Strategy in 1998 and established a unit which acts as a coordinator for strategy implementation and coordinates to the parties for the growing ecosystem and social entrepreneurship (British Council 2017). It has been identified in the study of Macmillan (2013) that social entrepreneurship requires financial assistance for the purpose of gaining the support of society. This might also imply that social entrepreneurs would require government assistance because public funds could be utilized for society's and communities' benefit.

According to Bacq, Hartog and Hoogendoorn (2013), if the public sector of a country would provide support for the social entrepreneurship, the result would be in the new forms of enterprise which works for society's benefit. This might also result in getting popular support. The governments often provide benefits or support to social enterprise in order to gain public preference, popular support and loyalty towards the government. For instance, the community interest company has been created in the social sector in order to fulfil social purposes (Cotterrell 2013). According to Ridley-Duff and Bull (2015), the support of government for social entrepreneurship could be resulted in high significance for financing and supporting businesses through which people would also be benefited and provide popular support to the government.

According to a meta-analysis conducted by Hayllar and Wettenhall (2013, p.207), the socio-economic development of a country is dependent upon government policies and strategies for societal good. This might lead to another notion of social entrepreneurship that the social entrepreneurship has the main aim to provide assistance to society and community through which the socio-economic development of the community can be achieved. As defined by Salamon and Sokolowski (2016, p.1515), the government's support of social entrepreneurship can result in the socio-economic development of society. This might also imply that the social entrepreneurship sector and the government should work hand in hand in order to achieve development goals and objectives for the society, which would also be resulted in the betterment of society.

However, critics have given a bit different view for the government support for social entrepreneurship. This includes the study of Choi and Majumdar (2014) that social entrepreneurship might require the support of the government, but it also requires support from the private sector. The implications of this notion suggest that private sectors also play an important role by adopting the policies of corporate social responsibility leading towards gaining prominence in the business sector. According to Di Zhang and Swanson (2013), private companies in the UK support social entrepreneurship by providing support for tax reduction and other means of support for social enterprises. For instance, the Law on Promotion of Social WED has supported the involvement of the private sector in order to revoke restrictions of stock ownership (Vickers and Lyon 2014). This has also increased the support of the private sector for social entrepreneurship.

Social Entrepreneurship and Indonesia

Indonesia is considered to be a populous country which has been facing a myriad of social and economic problems (Anggadwita and Dhewanto 2016). In accordance with one study conducted by Idris and Hijrah Hati (2013), the government of Indonesia has a significant influence on training and education of social entrepreneurship which has been fervently debated. The debates on this issue have been related to the low level of government's involvement due to which the progress for the development is relatively slow. During a number of heated debates, Kickul and Lyons (2016) stated that social entrepreneurs face major hurdles and barriers which do not ensure access to credit and finance for education and training without productive and collateral resources which should be provided to marginalised groups and individuals of the society. In this way, access to credit might be considered as crucial for getting training and education of social entrepreneurship for both men and women in Indonesian society.

The case study analysis conducted by Wiguna and Manzilati (2014) stated that in Indonesia, the dominant and leading form of employment had been considered as within the nonformal sector. The non-formal sector is the one which is not controlled by the government (Latchem 2014). During the crises of East Asian Monetary, employment has been declined in the non-formal sector. This decline as defined by Sekliuckiene and Kisielius (2015) has resulted in 70% workers being displaced from modern and contemporary sectors the non-formal sectors which implied that most of the analysts expect this sector as the one which has a tendency to absorb the new entrants in labour market. Therefore, social entrepreneurship in Indonesia has a main focus on the micro-enterprises which make social entrepreneurship sector to contribute to the country's economic success. Traditionally, as said by Roth (2014) small business in the non-formal sector of Indonesia has been characterized by the primary methods of production and has limited access to capital and market which has led to the underdevelopment of the sector of social entrepreneurship (Richstein and Lins, 2018).

The contribution of Anggadwita and Dhewanto (2016) in the field of social entrepreneurship has formalised the aspect that payment in non-formal sectors has become a

big issue due to profit sharing and sales commission. In most of the developing countries like social entrepreneurship has been the reason for achieving popular support for the government in society. However, Razafindrambinina and Sabran (2014) and Ramadani et al. (2013) stated that in developing countries like Indonesia, the social enterprises had been exempted from the taxes, which also challenge government involvement in the development of social entrepreneurship. Nevertheless, the government of Indonesia has created a regulatory framework for social entrepreneurs in order to support the mission of social entrepreneurs and for gaining socio-economic development in the country.

Regulatory Framework for Social Entrepreneurship in Indonesia

According to Turner (2013) in Indonesia, the development of social entrepreneurship is considered significant. A large number of applicants coming for “Community Entrepreneurship Challenge” which was organized in Indonesia by British Council has been the reason why social entrepreneurship has been considered significant. Social entrepreneurship has been emerging in Indonesia in the form of Civil Society Organizations. Peredo et al. (2004) and Payumo et al. (2014) explained that the emergence of civil society in Indonesia has also included non-governmental organizations (NGO's) is regulated under laws and regulations. There are many types of social enterprises which have been operating in Indonesia, and some of them are included under the terms of Cooperative and Private Limited Company as a legal entity. Therefore, each company must comply with laws and regulations. However, Frynas and Stephens (2015) identified that there does not have to be a specific law in Indonesia for the regulation of social enterprises which might be due to the fact that government has been unable to comprehend unique and distinguishing features of social enterprises. Nevertheless, the Indonesian government has been aware of the existence of these enterprises. This awareness has led towards many programs which have included young people, especially students and professionals who have been inclined towards providing volunteering services as well as working for social enterprises as their chosen professions.

There has been a number of events held in the city of Jakarta, for instance, the competitions and seminars for covering different areas of social entrepreneurship also held by the state-owned companies. These competitions could not be regarded as a suitable means for promoting social enterprises because of the lack of prior rules and regulations. However, according to Jain and Ali (2013), the prevailing regulations which have been related to social entrepreneurship such as Private Limited Law and Cooperative Law has not been providing support for social entrepreneurship. The lack of support for social enterprise has been due to the fact that social enterprises have been facing issues with capital and capacity more than the other private organizations. The study conducted by Acs, Autio and Szerb (2014) in Indonesia the governmental bodies provide an opportunity for social entrepreneurship in order to receive tax exemption and financial support leading towards the development of social entrepreneurship in the country. However, the support system for social entrepreneurship has lacked due to the up-scaling of private sectors in international markets. Razafindrambinina and Sabran (2014) stated that social entrepreneurship needs a high level of financial assistance due to non-profitable means of business transactions. For this matter, the government of Indonesia has created integration between public and private firms in order to reach towards the higher development of social entrepreneurship in the country. The integration between the public and private sector might result in the providence of capital and finance for the development of the social entrepreneurship sector.

Conceptual Framework

The secondary research indicates that Bacq, Hartog and Hoogendoorn (2013) identified four major factors that have a positive impact on the development of social enterprises in an economy. Therefore, it is important to assess whether these factors are effective in Indonesia to foster the development of social enterprises. Thus, these variables are critical components of the conceptual framework in this study:

Awareness about existing Social Issues in Indonesia

Social enterprises are developed when there is a high level of awareness about existing social issues in society. Investors and entrepreneurs are likely to put in efforts to develop social enterprises provided that they are inclined to engage in businesses that not only provide financial gains to investors but also have positive impacts on society. Leonardi, Huysman and Steinfield (2013) provided empirical results and concluded that social entrepreneurs could be defined as those individuals that have an inclination towards solving problems in the society. Thus, this study infers that the higher the number of people that are willing to contribute towards the benefits of society, the higher is the probability that they will engage in establishing a social enterprise.

The secondary research also indicates that the development of social enterprises is also dependent upon the popularity of social missions in the business world. This is the result of the awareness level in society. The higher the awareness about social issues, the higher is the likelihood that investors and entrepreneurs would gather to develop social enterprises. The fundamental aim of social enterprise is to develop profitable businesses and social ventures where they attempt to make improvement in the community infrastructure. Social missions are likely to have a significant impact on the development of social enterprises (Wilson and Post, 2013). Within a similar context, the study conducted by Lombard (2014) also indicated that resources of the society could be effectively utilised to promote the betterment of the society provided that they are put in to foster social entrepreneurship. The underlying purpose is to use the resources of the economy not only to make a profit for individuals but also to contribute towards social issues such as poverty, improvement in healthcare, environmental issues, and traffic congestion.

Support for social enterprises is also important to factor in the development of social enterprises (Nandan, London and Blum 2014). The support not only comes from consumers but also from entrepreneurs, investors, government, non-governmental organisations, and other social stakeholders. Lee (2015) defined support development as the set of factors that enhance the support for social issues and development of social businesses which have a potentially high impact on addressing and managing societal issues. A social entrepreneur must have explicit aims and strategies to gather support for the enterprise from various stakeholders which include investors, consumers, suppliers, employees and from the government as well. If there is a lack of support from stakeholders, social enterprise is likely to fail. Within the same line of argument Covalleski, Dirsmith and Weiss (2013) argued that development support is also connected with a number of volunteers in a society that is willing to work social enterprises to contribute towards collective good of the society. If there is a high level of development support, then social enterprises are likely to succeed in the economy in competition with purely for-profit organisations. Social entrepreneurs must strive to search for like-minded people which include business experts and investors who would prefer to invest in social goals and objectives as compared to purely commercial goals and objectives (Satar and John, 2019).

Sustainable Business Models

One of the significant factors in the development of social enterprises is sustainable business models. Sustainable business models and philosophies are essential components of

the foundation of social development and social enterprises. This is because businesses cannot survive without making adequate profits, and thus the sustainable business model is critical for social business enterprises as it is for a purely for-profit business organisation. On the other hand, sustainable business models are also important for competitive advantage for businesses. In order to fully benefit society, a social enterprise must survive and remain profitable, which is only possible when it is operating on a sustainable business model (Abereijo 2016). Within this context, Scaffa and Reitz (2013) recommended that social entrepreneurs must develop effective business strategies to ensure that social business remains competitive and survive within a commercial context. This is because they are to provide sustainable income by utilising economic resources. Thus, effective business strategies are critical to utilise community resources efficiently.

Youth as a Factor of Social Entrepreneurship

The youth of society is critical for the future of society as they shape the business world. If youth pursue social enterprises to develop in a professional career and show interest in social enterprise development, then the long-term impact on society is significant. Bae et al. (2014) argued that the involvement of youth in social activities is critical to address social issues. Similar is the case for the development of social enterprises and involvement of youth and promoting social enterprise in youth is important. For instance, Sánchez (2013) argued that it is the responsibility of the social sector to nurture and attract young and fresh talent and bring them at the forefront of social entrepreneurship. The purpose is to get the youth involved in the development of social enterprises. Young people bring in fresh talent, creativity, and innovation in the business (Pascual, Oruezabala and Murillo, 2017). These are critical sources of competitive advantage for any business organisation, and thus, social enterprises can also equally benefit from the involvement of youth in social enterprise in the economy.

Vanevenhoven and Liguori (2013) conducted an empirical analysis and concluded that young people in society face austerity and a number of social challenges in society. Social enterprises can help to address these issues while also increasing employment of young people in society. The results of Vanevenhoven and Liguori (2013) leads us to conclude that there can be an effective relationship between social entrepreneurship and young generation. If the youth is mobilised to address social challenges as well as economic development, then the society is likely to grow at a faster pace. According to one survey conducted by Almeida, Ahmetoglu and Chamorro-Premuzic (2014), young students are more energetic and enthusiastic and can be beneficial for both society and the economy. This leads to the comprehension of the utmost importance of social entrepreneurship for society. If social enterprises are being led by young enthusiasts, the result might be a higher societal benefit and socio-economic development.

Government Support

States and Governments have a significant impact on the growth and development of businesses as well as societies in a country. Government policies and actions affect both businesses and society. Support from the government can be considered as a critical competitive advantage for industry. Although social enterprises are not industry-specific, however, support from government is critical for success. The government can provide support to industry through various actions and policies as well as through laws and regulations. Lately, several states have recognised the value of social enterprises and are determined to promote social enterprises as a tool for both economic and social development.

The study of Mazzucato (2015) concluded that social entrepreneurship should be identified as the third sector in the economy, and it should be positioned between the private sector and

government. In the case of the UK, a Social Enterprise Strategy was launched in the year 1998 following the establishment of a government unit to ensure proper coordination between government and social enterprises (British Council 2017). The most important support from the government comes in the form of financial support, and thus, social entrepreneurship is likely to develop at a faster pace if there is financial assistance from government and society (Macmillan 2013; Gill et al. 2017). Moreover, financial assistance also comes in various forms; for example, the government may decide to put in grants and interest-free loans for social enterprises. Tax relief is also considered to be an effective strategy to foster industry in the economy.

Bacq, Hartog and Hoogendoorn (2013) argued that governments typically provide financial support to the public sector for the purpose of providing better public services. Similarly, providing support for social enterprises is likely to encourage entrepreneurs to pursue social enterprises for professional careers. Government support also may serve as a motivating force for common public and investors are likely to be motivated to invest further in social enterprises as compared to the private sector (Ramadani *et al.*, 2013; Gabarret, Vedel and Decaillon, 2017; Jafari Sadeghi and Biancone, 2017a; Ardianti and Ingrid, 2018; Vita *et al.*, 2019). There are also other forms of support that the government can provide to encourage social enterprises which include subsidies on the products and services provided by social enterprises. Many of the underdeveloped countries provide subsidies to the agricultural sector in order to boost productivity and performance. This is because the agriculture sector is the main source of economic development for these countries. Similarly, if the government provides subsidies to social enterprises, they are likely to attract more investors and improve productivity and performance. Furthermore, higher productivity and performance is likely to boost the development of social enterprise sector which in turn has dual benefits for the society, namely an improvement in community infrastructure as well as economic benefits such as unemployment (Cotterrell). According to Ridley-Duff and Bull (2015), the support of government for social entrepreneurship could result in pooling economic and non-economic resources in the industry high which in turn helps in addressing key social issues without compromising economic development (Kee, 2017).

The results of a meta-analysis presented in Hayllar and Wettenhall (2013) shows that there is a significant relationship between socio-economic development of a country and policies and strategies of government. Within the context of social enterprises, socioeconomic development can be enhanced by promoting those business organisations that not only make a profit and provide economic benefits but also provide support to the government in addressing social issues. As defined by Salamon and Sokolowski (2016), the government's support of social entrepreneurship can result in the socio-economic development of society. Thus, it can be inferred that proper coordination and combined efforts of the government and social enterprise sector is likely to make improvement resolution of main social issues in the country.

However, critics have given a bit different view for the government support for social entrepreneurship. This includes the study of Choi and Majumdar (2014) that social entrepreneurship might require the support of the government, but it also requires support from the private sector. The implications of this notion suggest that private sectors also play an important role by adopting the policies of corporate social responsibility leading towards gaining prominence in the business sector. According to Di Zhang and Swanson (2013), private companies in the UK support social entrepreneurship by providing support for tax reduction and other means of support for social enterprises. For instance, the Law on Promotion of Social WED has supported the involvement of the private sector in order to revoke restrictions of stock ownership (Vickers and Lyon 2014). This has also increased the support of the private sector for social entrepreneurship (Vannebo and Grande, 2018).

The discussion above clearly indicates that there are certain factors in a country that can help to foster social enterprises in the economy. First, awareness about social issues and the will to address them is critical for the development of social enterprises. The higher the level of awareness the stronger is the will among various stakeholders which include entrepreneurs, investors, governments, and consumers among others; the higher is the likelihood that innovative social enterprises will increase in the economy. Furthermore, sustainable business models are also important for the development and survival of social enterprises. If social enterprises do not survive in the long run, it is unlikely that investors and entrepreneurs will show interest in establishing and running social enterprises. Thus, it is extremely important to develop effective business models for social enterprises that attract both financial and non-financial resources in this sector.

Furthermore, it can also be inferred that one of the important factors that positively contribute to the development of the social sector is the involvement of youth. Young people bring in fresh ideas, innovation and creativity in business strategies that can be used to ensure long term survival of social enterprises (Lučić, Dabić and Finley, 2019). Finally, government support is also considered to be critical for the success of the social enterprise as a sector in the economy. There are various ways that government can provide to social businesses which include financial support, tax relief, and subsidies, among others. All these factors are summarised in Figure 1:

Please insert **Figure 1** about here

Methodology and Data Collection

This study used an online survey to gather information regarding the perception of social enterprises and the role of government in supporting such enterprises. The online survey was sent to students in Universities in Jakarta through social media platforms, including Facebook, LinkedIn, and Whatsapp, following the research conducted by Bisconti et al. (2019). The survey was open for two weeks, and a total of one hundred responses were collected during the period. The survey questionnaire was inclusive of various sections on demographic characteristics, awareness regarding social entrepreneurship, and motivation level among students in order to establish social entrepreneurs in future endeavours. The questionnaire was designed on the Likert scale having closed-ended questions format. However, some of the questions were different from the Likert scale but closed-ended in order to understand the opinions of the students (Schmidt and Hunter 2014). The survey questionnaire is a commonly used method to collect valuable information from the respondents (Dana and Dana 2005; Dana and Dumez 2015). The research utilized the descriptive statistical analysis technique in order to generate quantifiable results. After the quantitative data analysis, the results were displayed in the form of tables and graphs. The demonstration of the data through the quantitative descriptive and statistical analysis enables to derive inferences and conclusion accomplishing the objectives of the research. A correlation analysis was conducted in order to evaluate the association between the role of the Indonesian government and the promotion of social entrepreneurship. A regression analysis was performed in order to investigate the dependent variable relationship with the independent variable.

Results and Discussion

In analysing the survey data, it was found that 47% of the respondents were male, and 53% of respondents were female. Also, out of the 100 respondents, 13% respondents were from the age bracket of 18-21 years, 18% were from 22-25 years, 22% respondents were from 26-

30 years, 36% respondents were from the age bracket of 31-34 years, and 11% respondents were 35 years or above. The majority of the respondents were from the age bracket of 31-34 years, and the minority of the participants were from age 35 and more. The first question of the online survey was directed towards the understanding of social entrepreneurship concepts on which the respondents must mark the suggested definitions according to their understanding level of social entrepreneurship. It can be comprehended from the table 1 presented below that around 23% of the respondents marked the first explanation of the social entrepreneurship which stated that the individuals with an innovative solution towards the society's most pressing social problems. Secondly, for the statement that social enterprise is a charity which is used as a social media technique for fundraising for which 27% of the respondents out of 100 were in support of this statement.

Please insert **Table 1** about here

The third statement speaks about that the social entrepreneurship is an independent business where the individual's acts as an agent of change for the environment of the society on which 25% respondents out of 100 marked to this statement. The fourth statement speaks about the social entrepreneurship are about looking for the solutions for the poor people problems to which 25% out of 100 respondents marked the following statement related to the purpose of the social enterprise. However, from the total results for the question, a slightly higher number of respondents were in support of the explanation that the social enterprises are a charity which uses social media for fundraising. Moreover, the number of participants who chose independent business individuals that act as agents of change for the environment and respondents were in support of the definition that social enterprises are about looking for solutions to poor people problems were in the same.

Please insert **Table 2** about here

Table 2 is the result of the question which was directed towards the assessment of whether the respondents were interested in being a social entrepreneur. To this question, a total of 40% of the respondents responded in favour of being a social entrepreneur that includes the scale of very interested and interested. In addition, there were 29% of the respondents who remained neutral with this question to which it was asserted that either they were not aware of the question or are indecisive about the fact that whether they want to be a social entrepreneur or not. On the other hand, there were 31% of the respondents who were not interested in becoming a social entrepreneur.

Please insert **Table 3** about here

Table 3 presents the results of respondents' interest sector when it comes to social enterprises. For this question, it was noted that around 10% of the respondents want to be the social entrepreneur in agriculture sector, 6% were interested in reducing poverty by introducing NGOs, 20% were interested in the healthcare sector, 28% of the respondents were interested in the education sector, 12% were interested in the fishery sector and the remaining respondents accounting for 24% were not interested in being a social entrepreneur. No respondent marked the others section, which makes apparent here that majority of the respondents wants to become a social entrepreneur in the educational sector of Indonesia.

Please insert **Table 4** about here

Results from table 4, can be interpreted that around 45% of the respondents of the study were in favour of the statement that the most common challenge faced by a Social entrepreneur is a lack of funds. In addition, 20% of the respondents were in the favour that the lack of entrepreneurial education is the common challenge which is faced by the social entrepreneur. Furthermore, 17% of the respondents stated that formulating strategy was the most common challenge faced by social entrepreneurs, whereas 18% marked the option of others. This highlights that the majority was in favour that funds are the major hurdle in the social entrepreneurship.

Please insert **Table 5** about here

Table 5 above highlights the responses with respect to the type of support the respondents were expecting from the Indonesian government. To this question, 23% of the respondents reported that the government would be helpful in providing adequate funds to the social entrepreneur. However, 19% of the respondents were in the favour that the government would be supportive in providing education about social entrepreneurship. In addition, 19% of the respondents were in the opinion that the Indonesian government would be helpful in providing ease of obtaining formal legality. Furthermore, approximately 18% of the respondents were in favour that the Indonesian government would be helpful in the continuity of the business. From the total responses, the majority of the reported that funds would be the best support expected from the Indonesian Government.

Please insert **Table 6** about here

From the table presented above, the question statement was directed towards that the Indonesian Government provides adequate management consultancy and legal counselling to the social entrepreneurs in the country. To this question, 25% of the respondents out of 100 were in favour of the statement that the government provides adequate support in terms of management consultancy and the legal counselling. In addition, around 15% of the respondents remained neutral to the statement which highlights either they were not aware of the question being asked by the researcher or did not want to comment on it. However, a total of 57% of the respondents negatively responded to the question. Therefore, the majority was not in favour of the statement that the Indonesia government provision of adequate support to social entrepreneurs.

Please insert **Table 7** about here

According to the table presented above, the question statement was focused towards that the Indonesian Government provides adequate marketing support in terms of social entrepreneurship. The result to this question implies that 13% of the respondents out of 100 were in favour of the statement that the government provides adequate support in terms of marketing of the social business of the social entrepreneur. In addition to the above statement, around 39% of the respondents remained neutral to the statement which reflects that either they were not aware of the question being asked by the researcher or did not want to comment on it. However, a total of 51% of the respondents did not respond positively towards the question statement. Therefore, the majority was not in favour of the statement that the Indonesia government provision of adequate support business in terms of marketing for the help of the social entrepreneurs.

Please insert **Table 8** here

The results mentioned in table 8 highlights that around 45% of the respondents were in favour of the statement that the Indonesian Government provides adequate financial support to social entrepreneurs. On the other hand, there were 32% of the respondents who responded negatively to the question statement reflecting that either they were not aware of the question statement or did not want to comment on this statement. Approximately 23% of the respondents were not in favour of the statement, which is the reason they did not agree with the fact that the government provide adequate financial support to social entrepreneurs.

Please insert **Table 9** about here

The results mentioned in the table presented above highlights that around 45% of the respondents were in favour of the statement that the Indonesian Government provides adequate financial support to the social entrepreneurs. On the other hand, there were 32% of the respondents who responded negatively to the question statement reflecting that either they were not aware of the question statement or did not want to comment on this statement. Approximately 23% of the respondents were not in favour of the statement that they did not agree with the fact that the government should provide adequate financial support to social entrepreneurs.

Please insert **Table 10** about here

The results revealed in table 10 reports that around 67% of the respondents which includes the scales of strongly agree and agree were in support of the statement that the regulatory environments and the bureaucratic procedures are favourable for the Indonesian social entrepreneurs. On the other hand, there were 21% of the respondents who responded negatively to the question statement reflecting that either they were not aware of the question statement or did not want to comment on this statement. In addition, a total of 12% of the respondents were not in favour of the statement.

Please insert **Table 11** about here

From the table presented above, it can be asserted that the majority of the respondents, approximately 57% were in favour of the statement that social entrepreneurs have adequate capacities to facilitate governmental procedures. However, there were 28% of the respondents who remained neutral with the question statement, implying that they neither agreed not to disagree with the statement. On the contrary side, there 15% of the respondents who completely disagree with the statement made by the researcher, implying that the majority of the Indonesian respondents supported the statement.

Please insert **Table 12** about here

In light of the table presented above, the question statement was focused towards that the government of Indonesia assist in providing new sources of the funding in favour of social entrepreneurship. The result of this question implies that a total of 55% of the respondents out of 100 were in favour of the statement that the government assist in funding the social entrepreneurship. Further to add in the analysis, around 30% of the respondents remained neutral to the statement which reflects that either they were not aware of the question being asked by the researcher or does not want to comment on it. Conversely, a total of 15% of the respondents did not respond positively towards the question statement.

Please insert **Table 13** about here

The last question of the online survey was intended towards assessing whether the government should focus on promoting the idea of innovation to the social entrepreneurs. In response to this question, 55% of the respondents were in support of the statement the government should promote the idea of innovation in their social businesses. In addition, there were 32% of the respondents who remained neutral to the question being asked by the researcher in the online survey implying that they neither agreed nor disagree with this idea. On the different side, there were only 13% of respondents who were not in support of the statement that the government of Indonesia should promote the idea of innovation in the business plan.

Please insert **Table 14** about here

Table 14 represents the Pearson correlation which defines the strength of the relationship between the dependent and independent variables of the study. In this research, the independent variable is the role of government, and the dependent variable is the promotion of the social entrepreneurship with a specific focus in Indonesia. From the correlation value, it can be asserted that the correlation value of the variables is estimated at 0.764 or 76.4% which explains that if the role of the government increases then there will be the significant promotion of social entrepreneurship in Indonesia. The value reflects the positive correlation between the role of government and the social entrepreneurship promotion in Indonesia. In addition, Sig. (2-tailed) value is estimated at 0.000, which also implies a statistically significant correlation between the variables.

Please insert **Table 15** about here

Table 15 represents the model summary along with the overall fit statistics. In this table, it can be identified that the adjusted R^2 of the model is 0.579 with the $R^2=0.583$, which implies that linear regression explains the 58.3% of the variance between the dependent and independent variable. The model also reflects the value of R, which is also significant and reflects the variation in the variables.

Please insert **Table 16** about here

The ANOVA analysis (Table 16) describes how the model fits into the data of the research and also examines the goodness of fit statistics. It can be observed from the table that the sig value is at 0.000 which implies that the dependent variable (promotion of social entrepreneurship) can be significantly explained by the predictor (Role of government) of the selected study.

Please insert **Table 17** about here

Eventually, Table 17 explains the outcome of the regression, which highlights whether the influence of predictors on the dependent variables exists in the data. The sig values should be lesser than 0.05. However, it can be observed from the table presented that all the values are significant as they are less than 0.05. It can be said that there is a significant influence on the role of government on the promotion of the social enterprise.

Conclusion

This study concludes that Indonesia is a populous country facing, which is a myriad of economic and social problems. This study seconds the opinions of Idris and Hijrah Hati (2013) that the Indonesian government can play a significant role in training and education of youth and promote social entrepreneurship in order to reap both social and economic benefits from this phenomenon. The discussion indicates that there are some major hurdles faced by social entrepreneurs, and they need support to overcome barriers to business success, such as access to financing in terms of credit and insurance. They also need education and training so that they can develop effective business models that ensure sustainable success and profitability while having a positive impact on social issues in society. The access to credit is the main hurdle followed by training and education for the success of social entrepreneurship for both men and women in Indonesian society.

Furthermore, this study also finds that in the case of Indonesia non-formal sector is the leading and dominant and sector providing more employment as compared to formal sectors. Since there is less control of the government in the non-formal sector, therefore young entrepreneurs also face difficulty to gain government support. It is also important to note that this study shows that sustainable business models are essential for the success and longevity of social enterprises. It implies that social entrepreneurs must have effective business strategies to make sure that the business remains competitive and maintain profitability within a commercial environment (Choi and Majumdar 2014). The underlying purpose is to ensure sustainable income while making sure that existing resources are being utilised effectively. Thus, effective business strategies are critical to utilise community resources efficiently.

The emergence of youth entrepreneurship policies should be a confluence of two differentiated phenomena. Entrepreneurship is a strategic resource for countries to drive innovation in their economies and growth with an impact on employment. At the same time, given the difficulties faced by a large number of young people in the region in their insertion in the world of business, entrepreneurship is also seen as an immediate source of income for young people particularly in socio-economic disadvantaged communities and in terms of employability. As such, they pose major challenges for policymakers (Dana 2001; Zahra, Newey and Li 2014). The first challenge is the difficulty of standardizing responses when barriers and expected outcomes are different. The second challenge is that the solutions require participatory spaces where the private, public and non-governmental organizations actively intervene and develop strategic actions among themselves. The third challenge is that policies to stimulate youth entrepreneurship to face wide knowledge gaps and inertia of initiatives that have been replicated and expanded without evidence of their results.

Comparing this situation to the international agenda, youth development policies are being analysed from different scenarios and commitments (Dana, 2017; Olugbola, 2017). Countries at the regional and global levels have also signed Agenda 2030 for Sustainable Development at the UN General Assembly. The agenda has, among its 17 objectives and 169 goals, three objectives that are directly linked to the expected results of these policies, such as poverty elimination objective, decent employment objective and economic growth, and objective reduction of inequality. Additionally, at the regional level, the XXV Ibero-American Summit of Presidents and Heads of State of 2016 held in Colombia defined as a central theme "Youth, Entrepreneurship and Education", thus enabling a space for debate on the guidelines that these policies should adopt and thus generate effective solutions for young people in the countries of the region. The Indonesian government needs to identify existing and innovative mechanisms and make them visible to policymakers promoting youth entrepreneurship and social innovation in the region (Dana 1993; Giddens 2013; Shukaili et al. 2018). In order to do so, it is important to benefit from a varied set of experiences that are promoting youth

entrepreneurship and social innovation and providing solutions to the main obstacles faced by young people to develop successful trajectories in this field (Dana and Dumez, 2015; Dana, Grandinetti and Mason, 2016; Leclair, 2017; Jafari Sadeghi *et al.*, 2018).

There is a need to conduct illustrative and not an exhaustive survey of public, private and civil society initiatives taking place in the region. The survey of initiatives does not pretend to be exhaustive of the universe implemented in the region, but to have a set of initiatives illustrative in terms of its innovation and potential. This implies selecting a set of promising interventions in terms of results that, even when they do not have impact evaluations of these initiatives, propose novel aspects in their approaches to initiatives developed in the past, based on lessons learned and accumulated experience at the regional and local level. The review must identify a set of innovation dimensions and implications for policymakers (Dana 1992; Phillips *et al.* 2015). Among the aspects of innovation are the inclusion of the development of socio-emotional skills in young people and awareness of the benefits and returns of certain actions, learning to undertake from a concrete and guided practice, the vision that the process of undertaking goes through different stages in which differentiated services are demanded and therefore "tailor-made" initiatives are necessary, and the valuation of ecosystems to undertake where financial resources and support services converge as a way of innovating and achieving greater cost-effectiveness with respect to one-dimensional approaches that could rarely be efficiently coordinated (Nogueira *et al.*, 2019).

References

- Abereijo, I.O. (2016), Ensuring environmental sustainability through sustainable entrepreneurship. *Economic modelling, analysis, and policy for sustainability*, 234-249
- Acs, Z.J., Autio, E. and Szerb, L., (2014) National systems of entrepreneurship: Measurement issues and policy implications. *Research Policy*, 43(3), 476-494
- Akinbami, C. A. O. *et al.* (2019) 'Family business and succession in developing economies: the Nigerian perspective', *International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Small Business*, 38(1/2), p. 45. doi: 10.1504/IJESB.2019.102510.
- Almeida, P.I., Ahmetoglu, G. and Chamorro-Premuzic, T., (2014) Who wants to be an entrepreneur? The relationship between vocational interests and individual differences in entrepreneurship. *Journal of Career Assessment*, 22(1), 102-112
- Anderson, R. B. *et al.* (2005) 'Indigenous land rights in Canada: The foundation for development', *International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Small Business*, 2(2), pp. 104–133. doi: 10.1504/IJESB.2005.006809.
- Anderson, R. B., Dana, L. P. and Dana, T. E. (2006) 'Indigenous land rights, entrepreneurship, and economic development in Canada: "Opting-in" to the global economy', *Journal of World Business*, 41(1), pp. 45–55. doi: 10.1016/j.jwb.2005.10.005.
- Anggadwita, G. and Dhewanto, W., (2016) The influence of personal attitude and social perception on women entrepreneurial intentions in micro and small enterprises in Indonesia. *International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Small Business*, 27 (2-3), 131-148
- Ardianti, R. and Ingrid, N. A. (2018) 'Entrepreneurial motivation and entrepreneurial leadership of entrepreneurs: evidence from the formal and informal economies', *International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Small Business*, 33(2), p. 159. doi: 10.1504/IJESB.2018.090136.
- Bacq, S., Hartog, C. and Hoogendoorn, B., (2013) A quantitative comparison of social and commercial entrepreneurship: Toward a more nuanced understanding of social entrepreneurship organizations in context. *Journal of Social Entrepreneurship*, 4(1), 40-68
- Bae, T.J., Qian, S., Miao, C. and Fiet, J.O., (2014) The relationship between entrepreneurship education and entrepreneurial intentions: A meta-analytic review. *Entrepreneurship theory and practice*, 38(2), 217-254
- Becker, G.S. (2013) *The economic approach to human behaviour*. University of Chicago press
- Bisconti, C. *et al.* (2019) 'Influence parameters correlation in a Twitter event network', *International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Small Business*, 37(4), p. 513. doi: 10.1504/IJESB.2019.101697.
- British Council (2017) the UK launches international social investment strategy. [Online] Available from: <https://www.britishcouncil.org/society/social-enterprise/newsevents/news-uk-international-social-investment-strategy>. [31 July 2017]
- Bromley, P. and Meyer, J.W., (2014) "They Are All Organizations" The Cultural Roots of Blurring Between the Nonprofit, Business, and Government Sectors. *Administration & Society*
- Choi, N. and Majumdar, S., (2014) Social entrepreneurship as an essentially contested concept: Opening a new avenue for systematic future research. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 29(3), 363-376
- Cotterrell, R., (2013) *Law, culture and society: legal ideas in the mirror of social theory*. Ashgate Publishing, Ltd.
- Covaleski, M.A., Dirsmith, M.W. and Weiss, J.M., (2013) The social construction, challenge and transformation of a budgetary regime: The endogenization of welfare regulation by institutional entrepreneurs. *Accounting, Organizations and Society*, 38(5), 333-364

Dana, L.-P. (1992) 'A framework for the classification of government policy on entrepreneurship: contrasting six models', *Journal of Small Business & Entrepreneurship*, 10(1), pp. 2–12. doi: 10.1080/08276331.1992.10600416.

Dana, L.-P. (1993) 'Environment for Entrepreneurship: A Model of Public Policy and Economic Development', *The Journal of Entrepreneurship*, 2(1), pp. 73–86. doi: 10.1177/097135579300200105.

Dana, L.-P. (2017) *Entrepreneurship in Western Europe: A Contextual Perspective*. London: World Scientific Publishing Europe Ltd.

Dana, L.-P. and Dumez, H. (2015) 'Qualitative research revisited: epistemology of a comprehensive approach', *International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Small Business*, 26(2), pp. 154–170. doi: 10.1504/IJESB.2015.071822.

Dana, L. P. (2001) 'Networks, Internationalization & Policy', *Small Business Economics*, 16(2), pp. 57–62. doi: 10.1023/A:1011199116576.

Dana, L. P. (2017) 'International entrepreneurship research: how it evolved and directions for the future', *International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Small Business*. Inderscience Publishers (IEL), 30(4), pp. 477–489.

Dana, L. P. and Dana, T. E. (2005) 'Expanding the scope of methodologies used in entrepreneurship research', *International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Small Business*, 2(1), pp. 79–88. doi: 10.1504/IJESB.2005.006071.

Dana, L. P., Grandinetti, R. and Mason, M. C. (2016) 'International entrepreneurship, export planning and export performance: evidence from a sample of winemaking SMEs', *International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Small Business*, 29(4), p. 602. doi: 10.1504/IJESB.2016.079965.

Dana, L. P. and Wright, R. W. (2009) 'International entrepreneurship: research priorities for the future', *International Journal of Globalisation and Small Business*, 3(1), pp. 90–134. doi: 10.1504/IJGSB.2009.021572.

Di Zhang, D. and Swanson, L.A., (2013) Social entrepreneurship in non-profit organizations: An empirical investigation of the synergy between social and business objectives. *Journal of Nonprofit & Public Sector Marketing*, 25(1), 105-125

Fowler Jr, F.J., (2013) *Survey research methods*. Sage publications

Frynas, J.G. and Stephens, S., (2015) Political, corporate social responsibility: Reviewing theories and setting new agendas. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 17(4), 483-509

Fuller, T., Pearson, M., Peters, J. and Anderson, R., (2015) What affects authors' and editors' use of reporting guidelines? Findings from an online survey and qualitative interviews. *PloS one*, 10(4)

Gabarret, I., Vedel, B. and Decaillon, J. (2017) 'A social affair: identifying the motivation of social entrepreneurs', *International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Small Business*, 31(3), p. 399. doi: 10.1504/IJESB.2017.084845.

Ghaedi, M. and Madhoushi, M. (2018) 'Social capital, knowledge management and innovation performance', *International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Small Business*, 35(4), p. 579. doi: 10.1504/IJESB.2018.096176.

Giddens, A., (2013) *The third way: The renewal of social democracy*. John Wiley & Sons

Gill, A. et al. (2017) 'Human capital, financial strategy and small firm performance: a study of Canadian entrepreneurs', *International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Small Business*, 31(4), p. 492. doi: 10.1504/IJESB.2017.085428.

Hayllar, M.R. and Wettenhall, R., (2013) As public goes private, social emerges The rise of social enterprise. *Public Organization Review*, 13(2), 207

Idris, A. and Hijrah Hati, R., (2013) Social entrepreneurship in Indonesia: Lessons from the past. *Journal of Social Entrepreneurship*, 4(3), 277-301

Jafari Moghadam, S. (2017) 'Entrepreneurship Policy in Iran', in Rezaei, S., Dana, L.-P., and Ramadani, V. (eds) *Iranian Entrepreneurship: Deciphering the Entrepreneurial Ecosystem in Iran and in the Iranian Diaspora*. Cham: Springer, pp. 15–39.

Jafari Sadeghi, V. *et al.* (2018) 'How does export compliance influence the internationalization of firms: is it a threat or an opportunity?', *Journal of Global Entrepreneurship Research*, 8(1), p. 3. doi: 10.1186/s40497-018-0089-3.

Jafari Sadeghi, V., Nkongolo-Bakenda, J.-M., *et al.* (2019) 'An institution-based view of international entrepreneurship: A comparison of context-based and universal determinants in developing and economically advanced countries', *International Business Review*. Elsevier, 28(6), p. 101588. doi: 10.1016/j.ibusrev.2019.101588.

Jafari Sadeghi, V., Biancone, P. Pietro, *et al.* (2019) 'International entrepreneurship by particular people "on their own terms": evidence of universal attributes of entrepreneurs in evolving economies', *International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Small Business*, 37(2), pp. 288–308. doi: 10.1504/IJESB.2019.100109.

Jafari Sadeghi, V. and Biancone, P. Pietro (2017a) 'Exploring the Drivers of Gender Entrepreneurship: Focus on the motivational perspectives in USA, Italy and France', in Ratten, V. *et al.* (eds) *Gender and Family Entrepreneurship*. Routledge Taylor & Francis Group, pp. 124–141. Available at: <https://www.routledge.com/Gender-and-Family-Entrepreneurship/Ratten-Ramadani-Dana-Hisrich-Ferreira/p/book/9781138228870>.

Jafari Sadeghi, V. and Biancone, P. Pietro (2017b) 'How micro, small and medium-sized enterprises are driven outward the superior international trade performance? A multidimensional study on Italian food sector', *Research in International Business and Finance*. Elsevier, 45(August 2016), pp. 597–606. doi: 10.1016/j.ribaf.2017.07.136.

Jafari Sadeghi, V. and Biancone, P. Pietro (2017c) 'Shariah Compliant International Entrepreneurship: A Study of Islamic Finance in Europe', *European Journal of Islamic Finance*, (8), pp. 1–8. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.13135/2421-2172/2328>.

Jafari Sadeghi, V., Jashnsaz, A. and Honari Chobar, M. (2014) 'Organization's Conformity Assessment with Peter Senge's Learning Organization Principles in Municipality of Saveh: A Case Study', *Journal of Business and Management*, 16(5), pp. 51–58. Available at: <http://www.iosrjournals.org/iosr-jbm.html>.

Jafari Sadeghi, V., Kimiagari, S. and Biancone, P. Pietro (2019) 'Level of education and knowledge, foresight competency, and international entrepreneurship: A study of human capital determinants in the European countries', *European Business Review*, 32(2).

Jain, R. and Ali, S.W., (2013) A review of facilitators, barriers and gateways to entrepreneurship: directions for future research. *South Asian Journal of Management*, 20(3), 122

Kee, D. M. (2017) 'Defining social entrepreneurship: a Schumpeterian non-solution', *International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Small Business*, 31(3), p. 416. doi: 10.1504/IJESB.2017.084843.

Kickul, J. and Lyons, T.S., (2016) *Understanding social entrepreneurship: The relentless pursuit of mission in an ever-changing world*. Routledge

Kostetska, I. and Berezyak, I., (2014) Social entrepreneurship as an innovative solution mechanism of social problems of society. *Management Theory and Studies for Rural Business and Infrastructure Development*, 36(3), 569-577

Latchem, C.R. (2014) Informal learning and non-formal education for development. *Journal of Learning for Development-JL4D*, 1(1)

Leclair, L. A. (2017) 'Social entrepreneurship and social innovation as a tool of women social inclusion and sustainable heritage preservation: the case of the Sougha

Establishment in UAE', *International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Small Business*, 31(3), p. 345. doi: 10.1504/IJESB.2017.084846.

Lee, I. (2015) A social enterprise business model for social entrepreneurs: theoretical foundations and model development. *International Journal of Social Entrepreneurship and Innovation*, 3(4), 269-301

Leitch, C.M., McMullan, C. and Harrison, R.T., (2013) The development of entrepreneurial leadership: The role of human, social and institutional capital. *British Journal of Management*, 24(3), 347-366

Lemaire, S. L. L., Maalaoui, A. and Dana, L. P. (2017) 'Social entrepreneurship, age and gender: toward a model of social involvement in entrepreneurship', *International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Small Business*, 31(3), p. 363. doi: 10.1504/IJESB.2017.084844.

Leonardi, P.M., Huysman, M. and Steinfield, C., (2013) Enterprise social media: Definition, history, and prospects for the study of social technologies in organizations. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 19(1), 1-19

Lombard, A., (2014) Entrepreneurship In Africa: Social Work Challenges For Human, Social And Economic Development. *Social Work/Maatskaplike Werk*, 39(3)

Lučić, A., Dabić, M. and Finley, J. (2019) 'Marketing innovation and up-and-coming product and process innovation', *International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Small Business*, 37(3), p. 434. doi: 10.1504/IJESB.2019.101108.

Macmillan, R. (2013) 'Distinction' in the third sector. *Voluntary Sector Review*, 4(1), 39-54

Mazzucato, M., (2015) *The entrepreneurial state: Debunking public vs private sector myths* (Vol. 1). Anthem Press

Mertens, D.M. (2014) *Research and evaluation in education and psychology: Integrating diversity with quantitative, qualitative, and mixed methods*. Sage publications

Meyer, M., Narjoud, S. and Granata, J. (2017) 'When collective action drives corporate social responsibility implementation in small and medium-sized enterprises: the case of a network of French winemaking cooperatives', *International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Small Business*, 32(1/2), p. 7. doi: 10.1504/IJESB.2017.086002.

Nandan, M., London, M. and Blum, T.C., (2014) Community practice social entrepreneurship: an interdisciplinary approach to graduate education. *International Journal of Social Entrepreneurship and Innovation*, 3(1), 51-70

Nogueira, M. Á. *et al.* (2019) 'The hidden effect of innovation on the growth of Spanish firms', *International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Small Business*, 37(2), p. 167. doi: 10.1504/IJESB.2019.100103.

Olugbola, S. A. (2017) 'Exploring entrepreneurial readiness of youth and startup success components: Entrepreneurship training as a moderator', *Journal of Innovation & Knowledge*. *Journal of Innovation & Knowledge*, 2(3), pp. 155–171. doi: 10.1016/j.jik.2016.12.004.

Osburg, T. and Schmidpeter, R., (2013) Social innovation. *Solutions for a sustainable future*. Springer

Packard, M.D., (2017) Where did interpretivism go in the theory of entrepreneurship? *Journal of Business Venturing*

Pascual, C. O., Oruezabala, G. and Murillo, Y. S. (2017) 'Innovation ecosystem: a trigger for new product development? Exploring the acceptance of a sparkling red wine amongst Spanish small business actors', *International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Small Business*, 32(1/2), p. 47. doi: 10.1504/IJESB.2017.085985.

Payumo, J.G., Arasu, P., Fauzi, A.M., Siregar, I.Z. and Noviana, D., (2014) An entrepreneurial, research-based university model focused on intellectual property

management for economic development in emerging economies: The case of Bogor Agricultural University, Indonesia. *World patent information*, 36, 22-31

Peredo, A. M. *et al.* (2004) 'Towards a theory of indigenous entrepreneurship', *International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Small Business*, 1(1/2), pp. 1–20. doi: 10.1504/IJESB.2004.005374.

Phillips, W., Lee, H., Ghobadian, A., O'Regan, N. and James, P., (2015) Social innovation and social entrepreneurship: A systematic review. *Group & Organization Management*, 40(3), 428-461

Ramadani, V. *et al.* (2013) 'Women entrepreneurs in the Republic of Macedonia: waiting for directions', *International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Small Business*, 19(1), p. 95. doi: 10.1504/IJESB.2013.054330.

Ratten, V. and Dana, L.-P. (2017) 'Gendered perspective of indigenous entrepreneurship', *Small Enterprise Research*. Taylor & Francis, 24(1), pp. 62–72. doi: 10.1080/13215906.2017.1289858.

Razafindrambinina, D. and Sabran, A., (2014) The impact of strategic corporate social responsibility on operating performance: An Investigation Using Data Envelopment Analysis in Indonesia. *Journal of Business Studies Quarterly*, 6(1), 68

Richstein, R. and Lins, E. (2018) 'Venture capital for German high-tech new ventures: disentangling the role of human capital for funding success', *International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Small Business*, 33(1), p. 88. doi: 10.1504/IJESB.2018.088682.

Ridley-Duff, R. and Bull, M., (2015) *Understanding social enterprise: Theory and Practice*. Sage

Roth, S., (2014) The eye-patch of the beholder: introduction to entrepreneurship and piracy. *International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Small Business*, 22(4), 399-407

Roumboutsos, A. and Pantelias, A., (2015) Allocating revenue risk in transport infrastructure public-private partnership projects: How it matters. *Transport Reviews*, 35(2), 183-203

Salamon, L.M. and Sokolowski, S.W., (2016) Beyond nonprofits: Re-conceptualizing the third sector. *VOLUNTAS: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, 27(4), 1515-1545

Satar, M. S. and John, S. (2019) 'The critical success factors of social entrepreneurship in India: an empirical study', *International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Small Business*, 37(3), p. 309. doi: 10.1504/IJESB.2019.101103.

Sánchez, J.C. (2013) The impact of an entrepreneurship education program on entrepreneurial competencies and intention. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 51(3), 447-465

Shahidullah, A. K. M. and Islam, D. (2018) 'Social entrepreneurship by cooperative: examining value chain options of an indigenous fisherman's co-op', *International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Small Business*, 35(4), p. 598. doi: 10.1504/IJESB.2018.096177.

Scaffa, M.E. and Reitz, S.M., (2013) *Occupational therapy community-based practice settings*. FA Davis

Schmidt, F.L. and Hunter, J.E., (2014) *Methods of meta-analysis: Correcting error and bias in research findings*. Sage publications

Schönbrodt, F.D. and Perugini, M., (2013) At what sample size do correlations stabilize?. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 47(5), 609-612

Sekliuckiene, J. and Kisielius, E., (2015) Development of social entrepreneurship initiatives: a theoretical framework. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 213, pp.1015-1019

Shukaili, A. Al *et al.* (2018) 'Entrepreneurship policy to overcome barriers to new firm growth in a developing economy: evidence from Oman', *International Journal of*

Entrepreneurship and Small Business, 35(4), p. 511. doi: 10.1504/IJESB.2018.096173.

Tsang, E.W., (2014) Case studies and generalization in information systems research: A critical realist perspective. *The Journal of Strategic Information Systems*, 23(2), 174-186

Turner, S., (2013) *Indonesia's small entrepreneurs: Trading on the margins*. Routledge

Uprichard, E., (2013) Sampling: bridging probability and non-probability designs. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 16(1), 1-11

Vanevenhoven, J. and Liguori, E., (2013) The impact of entrepreneurship education: Introducing the entrepreneurship education project. *Journal of small business management*, 51(3), 315-328

Vannebo, B. I. and Grande, J. (2018) 'Social entrepreneurship and embedded ties - a comparative case study of social entrepreneurship in Norway', *International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Small Business*, 33(3), p. 417. doi: 10.1504/IJESB.2018.090226.

Vickers, I. and Lyon, F., (2014) Beyond green niches? Growth strategies for environmentally motivated social enterprises. *International Small Business Journal*, 32(4), 449-470

Vita, G. Di *et al.* (2019) 'Owner motivation in small size family farms: insights from an exploratory study on the ornamental plant industry', *International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Small Business*. Inderscience Publishers (IEL), 38(1-2), pp. 60-77.

Wiguna, A.B. and Manzilati, A., (2014) Social Entrepreneurship and Socio-entrepreneurship: A Study with Economic and Social Perspective. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 115, 12-18

Wilson, F. and Post, J.E., (2013) Business models for people, planet (& profits): exploring the phenomena of social business, a market-based approach to social value creation. *Small Business Economics*, 1-23

Zahra, S.A. and Wright, M., (2016) Understanding the social role of entrepreneurship. *Journal of Management Studies*, 53(4), 610-629

Zahra, S.A., Newey, L.R. and Li, Y., (2014) On the frontiers: The implications of social entrepreneurship for international entrepreneurship. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 38(1), 137-158

Figure 1. Influential factors for social entrepreneurship in Indonesia



Table 1. Understanding of social enterprise

Which one of the following statements best matches your understanding of social entrepreneurship?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Individuals with innovative solutions to society's most pressing social problems	23	23.0	23.0	23.0
	Social enterprises are a charity that uses social media for fundraising	27	27.0	27.0	50.0
	Independent business individuals that act as agents of change for the environment	25	25.0	25.0	75.0
	Social enterprises are about looking for solutions to poor people problems	25	25.0	25.0	100.0
	Total	100	100.0	100.0	

Table 2. Interest in being a social entrepreneur

Are you interested in being a Social Entrepreneurship

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Very Interested	32	32.0	32.0	32.0
	Interested	8	8.0	8.0	40.0
	Neutral	29	29.0	29.0	69.0
	Not Interested	22	22.0	22.0	91.0
	Not Very Interested	9	9.0	9.0	100.0
	Total	100	100.0	100.0	

Table 3. Sectoral interest in social enterprise

Which sectors are you interested if you become a Social Entrepreneur in Indonesia?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Agriculture	10	10.0	10.0	10.0
	Poverty	6	6.0	6.0	16.0
	Healthcare	20	20.0	20.0	36.0
	Education	28	28.0	28.0	64.0
	Fishery	12	12.0	12.0	76.0
	Not Interested in Social Entrepreneurship	24	24.0	24.0	100.0
	Total	100	100.0	100.0	

Table 4. Challenges in social enterprise

What do you think is the most common challenge faced by Social Entrepreneurship?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Funds	45	45.0	45.0	45.0
	Lack of Entrepreneuership Education	20	20.0	20.0	65.0
	Strategy	17	17.0	17.0	82.0
	Others	18	18.0	18.0	100.0
	Total	100	100.0	100.0	

Table 5. The expectation of support from the Indonesian government

If you are interested in becoming a Social Entrepreneurship in the future, what kind of support do you expecting from the Indonesian Government?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Funds	23	23.0	23.0	23.0
	Education about Social Entrepreneurship	19	19.0	19.0	42.0
	Ease in Obtaining Formal Legality	19	19.0	19.0	61.0
	Guarantee of Intellectual Property	18	18.0	18.0	79.0
	Continuity of Business	21	21.0	21.0	100.0
	Total	100	100.0	100.0	

Table 6. Consulting and legal support

Indonesian Government provides adequate management consultancy and legal counseling

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Agree	25	25.0	25.0	25.0
	Neutral	15	15.0	15.0	40.0
	Disagree	35	35.0	35.0	75.0
	Strongly Disagree	25	25.0	25.0	100.0
	Total	100	100.0	100.0	

Table 7. Marketing support

Indonesian Government provides adequate marketing support in terms of Social Entrepreneurship

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Agree	13	13.0	13.0	13.0
	Neutral	26	26.0	26.0	39.0
	Disagree	34	34.0	34.0	73.0
	Strongly Disagree	27	27.0	27.0	100.0
Total		100	100.0	100.0	

Table 8. Financial support

Indonesian Government provides adequate financial support in terms of Social Entrepreneurship

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Agree	11	11.0	11.0	11.0
	Agree	34	34.0	34.0	45.0
	Neutral	32	32.0	32.0	77.0
	Disagree	20	20.0	20.0	97.0
	Strongly Disagree	3	3.0	3.0	100.0
Total		100	100.0	100.0	

Table 9. Role of social enterprise in economy

Social enterprises play an important role as an economic agent for Indonesia

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Agree	9	9.0	9.0	9.0
	Agree	42	42.0	42.0	51.0
	Neutral	27	27.0	27.0	78.0
	Disagree	19	19.0	19.0	97.0
	Strongly Disagree	3	3.0	3.0	100.0
	Total	100	100.0	100.0	

Table 10. Social enterprise regulatory environment

**Regulatory environments and bureaucratic procedures are favourable in
Indonesia for Social Entrepreneurs**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Agree	27	27.0	27.0	27.0
	Agree	40	40.0	40.0	67.0
	Neutral	21	21.0	21.0	88.0
	Disagree	12	12.0	12.0	100.0
	Total	100	100.0	100.0	

Table 11. Social entrepreneurs and government procedures

Social Entrepreneurs have adequate capacities to facilitate governmental procedures

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Agree	16	16.0	16.0	16.0
	Agree	41	41.0	41.0	57.0
	Neutral	28	28.0	28.0	85.0
	Disagree	12	12.0	12.0	97.0
	Strongly Disagree	3	3.0	3.0	100.0
	Total	100	100.0	100.0	

Table 12. Government assistance to new sources of funding

The government assist in providing new sources of funding for the social entrepreneurship

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Agree	14	14.0	14.0	14.0
	Agree	41	41.0	41.0	55.0
	Neutral	30	30.0	30.0	85.0
	Disagree	12	12.0	12.0	97.0
	Strongly Disagree	3	3.0	3.0	100.0
	Total	100	100.0	100.0	

Table 13. Social innovation support

Government also promotes the idea of innovation to the social entrepreneurs

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Agree	23	23.0	23.0	23.0
	Agree	32	32.0	32.0	55.0
	Neutral	32	32.0	32.0	87.0
	Disagree	13	13.0	13.0	100.0
	Total	100	100.0	100.0	

Table 14. Correlation analysis between the role of government and social entrepreneurship

Correlations			
		Role_of_Indonesian_Government	Promotion_of_Social_Entrepreneurship
Role_of_Indonesian_Government	Pearson Correlation	1	.764**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	100	100
Promotion_of_Social_Entrepreneurship	Pearson Correlation	.764**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	100	100

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Table 15. Regression analysis for the Model 1

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.764 ^a	.583	.579	.64008

a. Predictors: (Constant), Role_of_Indonesian_Government

Table 16. ANOVA analysis between the role of government and social entrepreneurship

ANOVA^a

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	56.169	1	56.169	137.096	.000 ^b
	Residual	40.151	98	.410		
	Total	96.320	99			

a. Dependent Variable: Promotion_of_Social_Entrepreneuership

b. Predictors: (Constant), Role_of_Indonesian_Government

Table 17. Coefficient between the role of government and social entrepreneurship

Coefficients^a

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
1 (Constant)	-.648	.193		-3.364	.001
Role_of_Indonesian_Government	1.077	.092	.764	11.709	.000

a. Dependent Variable: Promotion_of_Social_Entrepreneurship